

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 24, 2005. Claims 1 to 5, 7 to 20, 22 to 35, 37 to 50 and 52 to 60 remain pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 8, 16, 23, 31, 38, 46 and 53 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 37 and 52 were objected to for being dependent upon a cancelled claim. The dependency of Claims 37 and 52 has been corrected and therefore withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 31 to 35 and Claims 46 to 52 were indicated as being duplicate claims such that, should Claims 31 to 35 be found allowable, Claims 46 to 52 would be objected to. The Office Action likewise indicated that Claims 38 to 45 are duplicates of Claims 53 to 60 and therefore, Claims 53 to 60 would be objected to should Claims 38 to 45 be found to be allowable. However, Applicant disagrees since each group of claims are directed to different statutory subject matter. For example, Claims 31 to 35 and 38 to 45 are directed to a statutory computer-readable memory medium, whereas Claims 46 to 52 and 53 to 60 are directed to a statutory computer program. Thus, the claims, while including similar features, are directed to different statutory subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the duplicate claims objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 23, 38 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The rejections are respectfully traversed. More particularly, Applicant wishes to point out that, as clearly claimed in the claims, the first judgment means judges one print job selected by a user from among print jobs displayed by a display means. Thus, what is judged is which print job a user selects from a list.

With regard to the second judgment means, what is claimed is a printing apparatus to which the print job judged by the first judgment means is to be output. That is, once a user selects a print job from the list, a printer that the selected print job is to be output to is determined. Thus, Applicant fails to see any unclarity in the claims and therefore, the rejections are traversed.

Claims 1 to 5, 7, 16 to 20, 22, 31 to 35, 37, 46 to 50 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,089,765 (Mori) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,761, 480 (Fukada) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,624,909 (Czyszczewski), and Claims 8 to 15, 23 to 30, 38 to 45 and 53 to 60 were rejected under § 103(a) over Mori in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,068,361 (Mantell) and U.S. Patent No. 6,552,813 (Yacoub). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to reprinting of a print job. According to one aspect of the invention, a server stores both device-independent-format data and device-dependent-format data of a print job as reservation job data and manages the reservation job data even after a print data for the print job is output to a printing apparatus. Then, if there is a request to reprint the data, the server can simply look at attributes of the reprint request and compare them with the reservation data to determine if they are the same. If so, then the stored device-dependent-format data can simply be output to the printing apparatus by the server. If not, then the server can send the stored device-independent-format data to an information processing apparatus to be processed by a printer driver into device-dependent-format data so it can then be reprinted.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is a print server apparatus capable of receiving a print job to be printed from an information processing apparatus through a network, the printer server apparatus comprising

reservation job management means for storing, in a memory, both device-independent-format data and device-dependent-format data of the print job as reservation job data, received from the information processing apparatus, and managing the reservation job data even after print data for the print job is output to a printing apparatus, determination means for determining whether attributes are different based on a printer driver name for an output destination for reprint and a printer driver name for the reservation job data managed by the reservation job management means, and output control means for outputting the device-independent-format data to the information processing apparatus, if the determination means determines that the attributes are different, while outputting the device-dependent-format data to the output destination, if the determination means determines that the attributes are the same, wherein the device-dependent-format data is data generated by a printer driver corresponding to the output destination, and the device-independent-format data is data generated prior to a generation process by a printer driver corresponding to the output destination.

Amended independent Claims 16, 31 and 46 are method, memory medium and computer program claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 1.

Amended independent Claim 8 includes features along the lines of Claim 1, but is more specifically directed to an information processing apparatus for generating print data to be printed by a printing apparatus through a network, the information processing apparatus comprising data generation means for generating device-dependent-format data to be printed by the printing apparatus using a printer driver corresponding to the printing apparatus, obtaining means for obtaining device-independent-format data, display means for displaying a list of print jobs to be reprinted after print data is output to the printing apparatus, first judgment means for judging one print job selected by a user from among

the print jobs displayed by the display means, and second judgment means for judging a printing apparatus to which the print job judged by the first judgment means is to be output, wherein the data generation means receives the device-independent-format data obtained by the obtaining means and generates the device-dependent-format data using another printer driver, if the printing apparatus judged by the second judgment means is different from the printing apparatus of an original output destination, wherein the device-dependent-format data is data generated by a printer driver corresponding to a printing apparatus that prints out the print data, and the device-independent-format data is data generated prior to a generation process by a printer driver corresponding to a printing apparatus that prints out the print data.

Amended independent Claims 23, 38 and 53 are method, memory medium and computer program claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 8.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the present invention. More particularly, with regard to Claims 1, 16, 31 and 46, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a server determining whether attributes are different based on a printer driver name for an output destination for reprint and a printer driver name for reservation job data that comprises both device-dependent-format data generated by a printer driver corresponding to an output destination and device-independent-format data that is data generated prior to a generation process by a printer driver corresponding to the output destination, and outputting the device-independent-format data to the information processing apparatus if the attributes are different, while outputting the device-dependent-format data to the output destination if the attributes are the same. With regard to Claims 8, 23, 38 and 53, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of an information processing apparatus judging

one print job selected by a user from among print jobs displayed by a display means, and judging a printing apparatus to which the print job judged by the first judgment means is to be output, wherein device-dependent-format data is generated from obtained device-independent-format data using another printer driver, if the judged printing apparatus judged is different from a printing apparatus of an original output destination.

Mori is merely seen to teach a print system comprising a computer and a printer, where the computer retransmits print data stored in the computer or regenerated in the computer to the printer in response to a retransmission request from the printer. What is taught in Mori is storing the device-dependent-format data in the computer, but Mori is not seen to teach storing device-independent-format data.

Fukuda is merely directed to updating a driver on an image processing apparatus. However, Fukuda is not seen to disclose or to suggest anything that, when combined with Mori, would have resulted in at least the feature of a server determining whether attributes are different based on a printer driver name for an output destination for reprint and a printer driver name for reservation job data that comprises both device-dependent-format data generated by a printer driver corresponding to an output destination and device-independent-format data that is data generated prior to a generation process by a printer driver corresponding to the output destination, and outputting the device-independent-format data to the information processing apparatus if the attributes are different, while outputting the device-dependent-format data to the output destination if the attributes are the same (Claims 1, 16, 31 and 46), or at least the feature of an information processing apparatus judging one print job selected by a user from among print jobs displayed by a display means, and judging a printing apparatus to which the print job judged by the first judgment means is to be output, wherein device-dependent-format data

is generated from obtained device-independent-format data using another printer driver, if the judged printing apparatus judged is different from a printing apparatus of an original output destination (Claims 8, 23, 38 and 53).

Czyszczewski is merely seen to disclose retaining halftone device-dependent-format data and gray scale device-independent-format data. However, Czyszczewski is not seen to disclose or to suggest anything that, when combined with Mori and/or Fukada, would have resulted in at least the feature of a server determining whether attributes are different based on a printer driver name for an output destination for reprint and a printer driver name for reservation job data that comprises both device-dependent-format data generated by a printer driver corresponding to an output destination and device-independent-format data that is data generated prior to a generation process by a printer driver corresponding to the output destination, and outputting the device-independent-format data to the information processing apparatus if the attributes are different, while outputting the device-dependent-format data to the output destination if the attributes are the same (Claims 1, 16, 31 and 46), or at least the feature of an information processing apparatus judging one print job selected by a user from among print jobs displayed by a display means, and judging a printing apparatus to which the print job judged by the first judgment means is to be output, wherein device-dependent-format data is generated from obtained device-independent-format data using another printer driver, if the judged printing apparatus judged is different from a printing apparatus of an original output destination (Claims 8, 23, 38 and 53).

Yacoub has been studied but is not seen to add anything that would overcome the foregoing deficiencies of Mori, Fukada and Czyszczewski.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'E. Kmett', is written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant
Edward A. Kmett
Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 95252v1